

---

**From:** Peterson, Erik  
**To:** Woodruff, Leigh; Henning, Alan  
**CC:** Wu, Jennifer; Helder, Dirk  
**Sent:** 6/25/2014 7:38:53 PM  
**Subject:** RE: WA buffers  
**Attachments:** Pacific Northwest Forestry Requirements for Aerial Application of Pesticides.doc

Alan has seen this document now for some time and it should be noted that there is more to pesticides requirements in the PNW and in Oregon than is captured here. I can't say with confidence, for example, that if you showed this to the states they would say, "sure, that captures our requirements completely." On the contrary, my guess is that Oregon has communicated a much fuller version of their requirements. And, to be clear, the CZARA work is going and has already gone deeper than this comparative analysis. That said, this document should give a rough sense of how the states compared to one another in 2011.

Erik Peterson  
Office of Ecosystems, Tribal and Public Affairs  
EPA Region 10 - Seattle  
[peterson.erik@epa.gov](mailto:peterson.erik@epa.gov)  
206-553-6382

**From:** Woodruff, Leigh  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 25, 2014 4:15 PM  
**To:** Henning, Alan  
**Cc:** Wu, Jennifer; Peterson, Erik; Helder, Dirk  
**Subject:** WA buffers

Alan –  
I thought your point about WA having 300 and 50 foot buffers was very interesting. They have clearly gone beyond FIFRA.

Do you happened to know if CA or other coastal states have established buffers for aerial application, beyond FIFRA? Knowing that may help us step back and gauge where the OR approach is across the broader playing field. However, even with that I think it is important to bear in mind the unique topography and numerous ESA species in western OR, conditions which may be different than in southern or eastern states.  
Leigh

Leigh Woodruff, Watershed Unit  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
950 W. Bannock, Suite 900  
Boise, Idaho 83702

PH: 208-378-5774  
Fax: 208-378-5744